

Remarks

The Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 6 because the citation "the distance" lacks antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that the objection should have been directed to claims 2 and 7 not 6 and thus claims 2 and 7 have been amended accordingly.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 3,192,805 to Manning. It is submitted that claim 1, as amended, and claim 6 distinguish over the Manning reference. More particularly, claims 1 and 6 require that the angle of the third wall of the tongue is opposite the angle of the third wall of the channel. This is what provides the greater cross-sectional area of the gap between the tongue and channel so as to cause the sealing material to flow in a particular direction. In Manning the angles of the third wall are substantially the same (not opposite) so that the tongue nests within the channel. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the positions of the respective walls when the parts are mated and to more clearly define the cross-sectional area of the gap between the tongue and channel which facilitates the flow of sealant.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 2-5 and 7-10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning. It is submitted that because Manning does not disclose the invention of claims 1 and 6, the claims that depend thereon are likewise patentable. Further it is submitted that there is no suggestion in Manning as to why it would be useful for the distance between the first wall of the channel and the first wall of the tongue is at least twice the distance between the second wall of the channel and the second wall of the tongue portion as recited in claims 2 and 7. The Examiner concedes that Manning does not teach that a distance between the first wall of the channel and the first wall of the tongue portion is at least twice the distance between the second wall of the channel and the second wall of the tongue portion, but the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to do so with the motivation to provide a gap for adjusting the distance in relation to clamping objects. It is respectfully submitted that no such motivation exists inasmuch as the pliers of Manning are already provided with a slot 7 for purposes of making such an adjustment. The Examiner further concedes that Manning does not teach that the

angle of the third wall of the channel is greater than the angle of the third wall of the tongue portion by at least 2 degrees, but that such a limitation would be the result of discovering the optimum or working ranges. It is respectfully, submitted that the disclosure of Manning is fairly specific regarding the optimum geometry for the device (see column 1, line 49 - column 2, line 36) so as to provide for the application of pressure to the rib 19 toward the bottom of the groove 11 where the rib is strongest. Accordingly Manning teaches away from the modifications suggested by the Examiner.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/617,635  
Amendment Dated 20 October 2005  
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2005

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,



Attorney for Applicant(s)

W. Michael Dixon  
Reg. No. 37,815  
Patent Department  
Deere & Company  
One John Deere Place  
Moline, IL 61265  
Telephone No. (309) 765-5159

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an  
envelope addressed to  
Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22303-1450  
on: 20 October 2005  
Date

Deere & Company  
Jaime Newkirk 20 October 2005  
Signature Date